

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL (37 CFR 1.8)Applicant(s): **Swift et al.**

Docket No.

VRex-0076

Serial No.

09/296,990

Filing Date

April 22, 1999

Examiner

Phillpe

Group Art Unit

2613Invention: **ENHANCEMENT TO LINE BLANKER SYSTEM****RECEIVED****DEC 30 2002****Technology Center 2600**I hereby certify that this **Response to Office Action Dated July 16, 2002***(Identify type of correspondence)*

is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: The

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231-0001 on **December 16, 2002***(Date)***Gerow D. Brill***(Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence)**(Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence)***COPI AVAILABLE****Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing.**

Vrex-0076



#10
BA 12/31/02

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Applicants: Swift et al.

Examiner: Gims S. Philippe

Serial Number: 09/296,990

Group Art Unit 2613

Filing Date: April 22, 1999

Attorney Docket No.: VRex-0076

Title: Enhancement to Line Blanker System

Honorable Director of Patents
And Trademarks

RECEIVED

DEC 30 2002

Technology Center 2600

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful attention accorded this Application and respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the Amendments set forth above and remarks below.

This is in response to the Office Action dated July 16, 2002 in which a shortened period of three months was set. Applicants hereby petition for a two-month extension to December 16, 2002 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) (\$460) and request the appropriate fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a)(2) be charged to the assignee's Deposit Account 501648.

REMARKS

This is a response to Office Action dated July 16, 2002 in which a shortened period of three months was set. The Applicant has amended the above referenced Application.

The Examiner has noted that claims 1-21 are pending in the application and that claims 1-21 have been rejected.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-21 under 35 USC Section 103 as being unpatentable over Zalm's US Patent 4,399,456 ('456) in view of Guralnick's US Patent 6,088,052 ('052).

The Applicants agree with the Examiner that Guralnick's '052 invention involves non-interleaved (progressive scan) displays. However, the Applicants do not believe it correct to combine the teachings of Zalm's '456 patent in a rejection under 35 USC 103(a). When

BEST AVAILABLE COPY